

ADDRESS
OF
WILLIAM HOWSHIP DICKINSON, M.D.,
PRESIDENT,
AT THE
ANNUAL MEETING, MARCH 1st, 1897.

GENTLEMEN,—Though the hand of death has been heavy upon us, we have nothing else to regret in the course of the last year. Our losses in some respects have been irreparable, but numerically they have been more than made up by fresh entries, which have been unexampled in number, as have been the deaths which we have to record.

The great financial event of the past twelve months has been the conversion of the debt, somewhat after the manner of Mr. Goschen, whereby the Society will profit to the amount of £358 a year. I trust that this saving may be wholly utilised in the reduction of our indebtedness. Once clear we shall command the influence of wealth as well as of knowledge; we shall be able to spend liberally within the limits assigned to us, and assume a position in all respects worthy of the greatest medical society in the Empire. The lowering of interest, right and necessary as it was, could not be accomplished

without concession on the part of those who retained their investment, and inconvenience to those who renounced it ; but the Fellows in general have contentedly deferred their private advantage to the public good, and acquiesced in an arrangement which in the state of the Society and the money market it was impossible to avoid.

Another event in the past year was the dinner at the Hotel Cecil. This was attended by 137 Fellows and guests. Many of the seniors of the Society were present, including two who have since been taken from us, and among the guests were many who honoured this Society as the representatives of others. Some shortcomings were to be regretted which another time can be guarded against, but on the whole the function seemed to give pleasure, and it is to be hoped that it tended to the consolidation of the Society, and the increase of its popularity. I trust that this social attempt may be repeated and improved upon, and if it should become annual I think it would be to the benefit of the Society. Even if such a friendly gathering does no good it can do no harm, for no one need take part in it who does not wish to do so, and the cost to the Society is nothing.

I now have to revert to a difficult, and in some respects a painful part of my task. The death-roll has been, as I have said, unprecedented, and not only in number but in the distinction of those who have been taken from us. It includes 1 Honorary and 23 Ordinary Fellows, some whose loss will be greatly felt within these walls. It includes three past-Presidents, seven Fellows of the Royal Society.

It will be my endeavour to present as truthful an account of each of the departed Fellows as my information allows. If I dwell more on professional achievements than personal characteristics, it will be because it is more easy to ascertain what a man did than what he was. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum* is a somewhat restrictive rule by which I shall not hold myself bound, but shall rather follow the example of the humble biographer of a great

man, "nothing extenuate nor aught set down in malice." Unmixed and indiscriminate eulogy is uninteresting because necessarily untruthful or incomplete. It will be my duty to refer to the lives of many who have enjoyed the esteem of a most critical profession, which is in itself a certificate of character, and a protection against the ill-nature of the most candid friend. But there is eternal truth in the saying of Johnson, "A fallible being will fail somewhere." Among those of whom I have to speak are five who attained to great distinction, and were the worthy recipients of honours conferred by the State. But though the same ends, professional eminence and royal favour, were reached by all, the roads were widely different, "as many arrows, loosed several ways, come to one mark."

I have prepared obituary notices, often necessarily brief, of all our Fellows who have died since the 1st of last March, and of four whose lives terminated before that date, but whose deaths were not made known to the Society in time to allow of previous mention. I have not thought it right wholly to omit any, holding as I do that every one who remained until death a Fellow of this Society is entitled to a permanent place in its records. Not counting the hitherto unmentioned losses which occurred before last March, we have before us an unprecedented, and even an appalling, tale of mortality. I will not tax the patience of the meeting by reading what I have written of all, but there are some whose position in the Society and in the profession was such as to demand even somewhat extended notice at this time and in this place.

The list of deaths since the last annual meeting is as follows:

Honorary Fellow.

Emil Du Bois Reymond . . . December 26th, 1896.

Ordinary Fellows

(Arranged in the order of their decease).

Dr. William Sharp . . .	April 10th, 1896.
Dr. Thomas Charles Steuart Corry	May 20th, 1896.
Sir John Russell Reynolds . .	May 29th, 1896.
Sir George Johnson . . .	June 3rd, 1896.
Dr. Charles Henry Ralfe . .	June 26th, 1896.
Thomas O'Connor	July 7th, 1896.
Dr. Alfred Thomas Brett . .	July 11th, 1896.
Dr. Henry Moore Bowman . .	July 17th, 1896.
Peter Yeames Gowlland . .	August 11th, 1896.
Paul Jackson	September 4th, 1896.
John Jones Merriman . . .	September 8th, 1896.
Sir John Eric Erichsen . . .	September 23rd, 1896.
Sir George Murray Humphry .	September 23rd, 1896.
Dr. John Langdon Haydon Langdon-Down	October 7th, 1896.
Dr. George Harley	October 27th, 1896.
William Edward Stewart . .	November 12th, 1896.
Dr. George Augustus Frederick Wilks	December 22nd, 1896.
William F. Butt	January 15th, 1897.
Dr. Edward Ballard	January 19th, 1897.
Sir Thomas Spencer Wells . .	January 31st, 1897.
Dr. James Ellison	January 31st, 1897.
George David Pollock . . .	February 14th, 1897.
William Smythe Crawford . .	February — 1897.

The Fellows whose deaths occurred before March 1st, 1896, but have not yet been mentioned, are the following :

Edmund Charles Johnson . .	January 3rd, 1895.
Richard King Peirce . . .	February, 1895.
Robert James Wilson . . .	February 16th, 1896.
Michael Henry Feeney . . .	February, 1896.

It is my first duty to bring before the Society the death of one of our Honorary Fellows, *Emil Du Bois*

Reymond, who died at Berlin on the 26th of last December, at the age of seventy-eight. His name is known to the whole world of biological science, and his fame is too securely established to need any corroboration from us. It is not necessary in this place to dwell upon researches which have become incorporated in the accepted total of knowledge ; it may be enough to say that his observations in connection with animal electricity marked an epoch in physiology, and were an important means of promoting the electrical branch of medicine.

Notwithstanding his French name, Du Bois Reymond was a German by birth, by education, and in sympathy. To speak of him worthily I may do so in the words of Professor Burdon Sanderson, "Du Bois Reymond probably never made an incorrect observation or performed a faulty experiment." In him we have lost one of the most famous of the eminent men who have adorned this Society by accepting honorary rank in it.

Before dealing with more recent losses, I may revert to that of *Mr. Edmund Charles Johnson*, who died in January, 1895, but whose death did not come to the knowledge of the Society in time to be taken notice of in the obituary of that or the succeeding year. It seemed to me that Mr. Johnson's benevolent and influential life should not be without notice in our annals.

He was the younger brother of the late Mr. Henry Charles Johnson, the well-known surgeon of St. George's. Mr. Edmund Johnson was born in 1821 and educated at King's College and St. George's Hospital. He became a Fellow of the College of Surgeons, and was one of the last recipients of the Lambeth M.D., which was conferred upon him by the then Archbishop of Canterbury in virtue of an ancient privilege which was abolished by the Medical Act of 1858. Mr. Johnson found his life's work when, at the age of twenty-two, he became the travelling companion of the late Viscount Cranbourne, the eldest brother of the present Marquis of Salisbury. Lord Cranbourne was blind, and his interests, in which Mr. Johnson par-

anticipated, were chiefly in the amelioration of the condition of his fellow sufferers. After visiting with Lord Cranbourne the principal blind schools in Europe, Mr. Johnson devoted himself to works of charity in this connection. He was the author of a report on the blind which was presented to the House of Commons in relation to the Paris Exhibition, and was offered, and refused, the decoration of the Legion of Honour. He became associated with many schools and institutions for the blind, and was a member of a Royal Commission on the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind, and in that capacity visited most of the institutions in England, Scotland, France, and Germany, whose purpose had reference to those classes. He was Vice-President of the Paris Congress on the blind, for which he was created an Officer of the Academy of France. He held many other honorary posts having relation to similar objects, and was the author of many works bearing upon them. Outside what may be called his speciality, he performed many honourable functions; among others he was Deputy Lieutenant for the Tower Hamlets, Chairman of Magistrates for Middlesex and Westminster, and Chairman of the Hanover Square Division of the County of London.

Spared by circumstances from the necessity of medical practice, his life was devoted to charitable purposes and public usefulness. For many years I knew him as a respected and public-spirited Governor of St. George's Hospital, and could relate instances in which he was of especial service to the hospital and to the staff, with which he was always in sympathy. His life was honourable in a double sense, not only in conduct but in position. He died suddenly of cardiac failure in his seventy-fourth year.

He will long be missed by a wide circle of friends, and at the benevolent institutions upon which his time and thought were so largely bestowed.

Richard King Peirce, who had retired long before his death and was latterly little known in this Society, was

born at Canterbury and received his medical education at St. Bartholomew's Hospital. After passing the College and Hall he went to India in charge of troops, but met with a severe accident on his way out, which necessitated his return. He presently set up at Madeley in Shropshire, and afterwards at Notting Hill, where he met with much success. He was at one time Surgeon for Women and Children at the Blenheim Street Dispensary. He gave up practice in 1882, and afterwards lived in the neighbourhood of Windsor Forest and at Maidenhead, and was well known as a follower of Her Majesty's Buck Hounds. In 1894 he went to the south of France in consequence of failing health, and died at Mentone in February, 1895, of pneumonia consequent on influenza, having just completed his seventy-second year.

Robert James Wilson was held in great esteem in the towns of Hastings and St. Leonards, where he practised, at first in partnership, latterly alone, for forty-two years.

He studied medicine at the Westminster Hospital. After obtaining the Membership of the College of Surgeons he became a Member, and afterwards a Fellow, of the College of Physicians of Edinburgh, at a time when these qualifications were held to entitle the possessor to the appellation of Doctor.

Mr., or Dr. Wilson as he was called, seems to have been a man of real excellence of character and great kindliness of disposition, and one who fully merited the confidence which was reposed in him not only by the residents of Hastings and St. Leonards, but by the strangers within their gates. He had a large practice, which included at times members of the Royal Family and other personages of distinction. He was widely benevolent, and was connected with several charitable institutions. He was of a retiring habit and never sought local offices; he accepted, however, that of Justice of the Peace for the Borough of Hastings. He was respected by the profession as well as by the public, and it may be said truly that his unobtrusive and unostentatious life was of more service

in his day and generation than that of many whom circumstances have placed in more prominent positions.

He died of pneumonia, which supervened upon heart-disease, on the 16th of February, 1896, at the age of sixty-eight.

Michael Henry Feeny was born at Castlebar, Co. Mayo, and received his medical education partly in Dublin and partly at St. Bartholomew's Hospital. He belonged to an ancient Irish family who were dispossessed of their lands in the comparatively modern time of Queen Elizabeth, and never recovered their former position. Mr. Feeny had two brothers in the medical profession, both of whom, like himself, died early.

Mr. Feeny was for some time the resident medical attendant of the late Lord Decies, who had a great regard for him. After Lord Decies' death Mr. Feeny practised first at Les Avants, in Switzerland, then in Lancashire. He never had good health. His final illness was connected with an abscess of the brain, for which he underwent an operation in the Home of St. Thomas's Hospital. He died in February, 1896.

The life of *Dr. William Sharp* takes us back to the early days of the Society. He was born in 1805, and became a Fellow in 1840, when Sir Benjamin Brodie was President. He was still writing in 1892, so his spell of mental activity was long, and he left behind him some results which cannot but be permanent. He was born in the West Riding of Yorkshire, educated there and at Westminster School, and in the West Riding apprenticed. His medical education was continued at the United Borough Hospitals and in Paris. He set up at Bradford, became Surgeon to the Bradford Infirmary, and in that town acquired a large general practice. His bent was to Science, and he became known as a promoter of local museums, in connection with which work he was, in 1840, made a Fellow of the Royal Society. After lecturing on chemistry at Hull he removed to Rugby, and was there active in advocating the teaching of Science in the public

schools. In 1850 he gave up the office of Reader in Natural Philosophy which he had held in Rugby School, and devoted himself to medical inquiries. It is probable that unconnected as he was at this time with any hospital, his researches were little corrected by pathological observations. Among other systems he studied that of Hahnemann, and was eventually led to renounce the errors of legitimate medicine for those of homœopathy. Legitimate medicine forty years ago was not wholly a beneficent art, and he may have been wisely sceptical on the one hand, though perhaps he was too credulous on the other. In 1856 he received the degree of M.D. from the Archbishop of Canterbury, from which it may be inferred that that ecclesiastic was less solicitous for orthodoxy in medicine than probably he was in theology.

Dr. Sharp was a voluminous writer. Our 'Transactions' contain a paper by him on Necrosis of the Jaw, which was published in the year 1844, before he changed his creed. His later productions were chiefly in the advocacy of homœopathy. In a cursory examination of them I have been struck with the apparent lack of pathological knowledge and consequent superficial views of disease; and with the general use of the *post hoc propter hoc* argument—the patient took the medicine and got well, therefore he got well because of the medicine. This argument is not confined to any system of medicine, nor is it always fallacious.

It is impossible to doubt that Dr. Sharp was fully convinced of the truth of what he promulgated. He was an "earnest inquirer," to borrow a phrase which is sometimes applied to other matters, but earnest and honest inquiry does not lead all minds to the same conclusions, even though it starts from the same premises. His claim to be remembered rests on his early efforts in the dissemination of scientific teaching. He died last April at the age of ninety-one.

Of Dr. Thomas Charles Steuart Corry, of Belfast, a brief notice must suffice. He was the eldest son of the late

T. C. S. Corry, M.P., of Rockcorry Castle. Dr. Corry was in general practice in Belfast, had been a dispensary officer in the time of the cholera epidemic about half a century ago, was long a guardian of the poor, and appears to have been constantly their friend. I learn that he was a man of wide charity, and was held in much esteem in his locality. He possessed some literary accomplishment, had brought together a considerable library, and was the author of 'A Guide to the Scenery, Music, and Antiquities of Ireland,' and of a volume of 'Irish Lyrics and Poems.'

Living as he did at Belfast he was known little in this Society, though he attained the rank of Vice-President at the Obstetrical.

Dr. Corry appears to have been one of those men who are happily not uncommon in the branch of the profession to which he belonged, whose best memorial is in the gratitude of the poor, whom he so actively and generously befriended. He died at Belfast, in May, 1896, in his seventy-first year.

Sir John Russell Reynolds was the son of a dissenting minister, and the grandson of a court physician. He was born in 1828. Having determined to follow the profession of his grandfather, he proceeded in due time to University College. Here his course as a student was one of much distinction, but his means were small and he did not at first think of settling in London; he had relatives at Leeds, and there commenced practice. Soon afterwards, however, he was recalled to town under circumstances which must receive mention. Dr. Reynolds, as he then was, had attended the demonstrations and acquired the friendship of Dr. Marshall Hall. This great physician being about to retire, or partially retire from practice, made over to Dr. Reynolds his house, furniture, and equipage. It could not be expected that these possessions should be transferred without payment, and Dr. Reynolds was as well entitled as another to become the purchaser. But Dr. Marshall Hall

issued a circular to his patients, commending Dr. Reynolds to them, and proposing to maintain with him a consultative relation. Dr. Hall was a Fellow of the College of Physicians, with which corporation Dr. Reynolds had, at this time, no connection whatever. Dr. Hall's part in this transaction was severely censured by the College. The censure was probably accentuated by the unbecoming attitude which Dr. Hall adopted towards the College, declining to appear before the Censors' Board, when summoned, and addressing it in a disrespectful and offensive style. This censure was administered in the year 1853. In the following year Dr. Reynolds became a Licentiate, and was made a Fellow in 1859, almost as soon as was possible. It may be inferred from his early selection for this honour that the College held him free from blame, whatever may have been the case with Dr. Marshall Hall. I have been told that Dr. Reynolds did not gain many patients directly, from this transaction, but it nevertheless placed him as the accredited successor of the physician who held the first place in regard to disorders of the nervous system, and contributed largely to his future fortunes.

Between the years 1855 and 1865 Dr. Reynolds became in due gradation, Assistant Physician to the Hospital for Sick Children, Assistant Physician to the Westminster Hospital, Assistant Physician and full Physician to University College Hospital, and finally, on the relinquishment of the Chair by Sir W. Jenner, Lecturer on Medicine. Dr. Reynolds' lectures are spoken of as exceptionally good; graceful and admirable in form and expression, they could not fail to be; but they are represented as not only instructive but complete in instruction, so that a student has been known to take a high place in Medicine at the University of London who used his notes of these lectures as his only text-book. In 1869 Dr. Reynolds was made a Fellow of the Royal Society at the instance of his teacher, Professor Sharpey. To bring to an end this enumeration of what may be termed his minor dis-

tinctions, distinctions which at least convey less prominence than the crowning honour which came towards the close of his life, he was chosen in 1878 as Physician to the Household.

Gifted with remarkable literary powers, Dr. Reynolds was a writer of rare grace and elegance. He has left behind him much that was useful and much that was attractive. It was not given to him, as to few, to write for all time. He left no permanent stepping-stones in the path of science. There have been greater clinical observers, more profound physicians, and more original thinkers, but perhaps few who could clothe the knowledge of the time in more appropriate and attractive language. His genius was of the second order—expository, not creative. Most of his writings bore upon disorders of the nervous system, and tended to enhance his practice in this speciality. The most noteworthy was his book on ‘Epilepsy’ published in the year 1861. This was the result of much work. I am told that he repeated many of the experiments there referred to. When this was written I suppose it was the best treatise in English on the subject. I need not specify many other briefer writings, chiefly in the form of papers and addresses. In the latter he often displayed a rare felicity, elevating the subjects on which he touched and often rising into poetry and eloquence. Among the papers is one which appears to me to be less judicious than others, since it commends the treatment of rheumatic fever by perchloride of iron, based on a doubtful analogy between rheumatism and such infective diseases as erysipelas and diphtheria. If in rheumatism acid abounds and elimination is to be desired, the introduction of a drug which is at once acid and astringent seems scarcely indicated. It is easy to pick out one paper among many with which every one is not in accord, but for most of the productions of his pen it is not possible to feel anything but admiration. His genius was more literary and philosophical than scientific, and the admiration due rather to the writer and thinker than to the physician or pathologist. His largest contri-

bution to medical literature was the 'System of Medicine,' in five volumes. Whether because the editor was indulgent or the contributors dilatory, thirteen years were allowed to elapse between the issue of the first volume and of the last. The work is unequal, but contains many papers of great merit, and was a valuable compendium of the knowledge of the time. Dr. Russell Reynolds took part with his brother in writing a novel entitled 'Yes or No.' I have not had an opportunity of seeing this, but it is described as semi-theological, and not unlike Kingsley's 'Two Years ago.' Not only was Russell Reynolds a polished writer, but he was, to use a fashionable term, a man of culture. He was widely read, his knowledge of the poets was continually in evidence, he was familiar with French and German, he was a musician, and something of an artist.

One who knew him intimately thus writes of Sir Russell Reynolds:—"He had many of the qualities of a fine physician. He was an excellent critic, and saw quite clearly the imperfections and half-truths of all systematic presentations of medicine. I think he always had before him that the patient was more than the sum of his diseases. He had a great deal of sympathy, perhaps too much. He was very jealous of overbearing the personality of his patient, and in this respect I think he was better than the great physician who preceded him in the Presidential chair. Although he had great critical faculty, and could show up inconsistencies and quackery, as he did in his address on specialism, he never, I am sure, said anything ungenerous of a fellow-worker, and I know that in some notable instances he was magnanimous. We always felt that he had it in him to do a great deal more than he did had he had the stimulus of necessity, but what he did was of very fine quality."

The crowning glory of his life was the Presidency of the College of Physicians, which fell to him by a majority of only two votes over the present holder of the office. For this post Dr. Reynolds was fitted by nature beyond most men. His never-failing courtesy, his considerate bearing

to one and all, his graceful language and refined utterance, combined to confer upon him, so long as his health lasted, rare qualifications for the Presidential chair. The Fellow of the College who beyond all others is qualified to speak of Sir Russell Reynolds in his Presidential capacity makes much of his native courtesy and kindness, gentleness and geniality, and speaks of his striking tranquillity and composure of demeanour even under very trying circumstances. He refers to his eloquence and grace of style, which were apparent in his extemporaneous utterances as well as in his more studied compositions. As President he was tried both by failing health and by the pressure of exceptional and extraneous duties ; but there were occasions, such as the delivery of the Annual Address, when his peculiar fitness for the office was conspicuous. His Presidency was marked by one important event, and the active part he took in regard to it. He strenuously and successfully opposed the admission of women to the diplomas of the College, and thus, says my informant (with whom personally I heartily agree), " he saved the College from a great disaster."

The accession of Dr. Russell Reynolds to the Chair at the College was followed by a baronetcy.

From what I have said it will readily be inferred that he acquired the attachment of all who were brought into contact with him, professionally or socially. This contributed, as it could not fail to do, to the success which was primarily due to his writings upon nerve disorders at a time when the modern lights were still below the horizon.

I now have to record the loss of a prominent Fellow, once President of this Society, and for many years a conspicuous figure in the medical life of the metropolis, *Sir George Johnson*. He was born at Goudhurst, in Kent, in which town he was educated, and in which county he was apprenticed. At the age of twenty-one he entered at King's College in the Medical Department, and became much distinguished as a student both there and at the University

of London. Not to mention the early steps of his professional career, Dr. Johnson was in 1847 appointed Assistant Physician to King's College Hospital, a promotion which he had fully earned. He remained an active member of the staff until 1886, when he became Consulting Physician. He had held many offices in the Medical School,—Resident Medical Tutor, Professor of *Materia Medica*, Professor of Medicine and afterwards of Clinical Medicine, which last post was exchanged on his retirement for that of Emeritus Professor of the same subject. At the College of Physicians Dr. Johnson held almost all the appointments possible to him excepting that of President; and even as to that, a considerable minority of votes were recorded in his favour on the occasion of Sir Andrew Clark's election, a minority which would have been larger but for Dr. Johnson's obviously failing health. Among his many distinctions, apart from his hospital and the Royal College, it is necessary to refer only to the most prominent, the Fellowship of the Royal Society, the position of Physician Extraordinary to the Queen, and knighthood. But Sir George Johnson's distinction did not rest on the honours he received, but on the work he performed. He early gave evidence of his ability in his book on kidney disease, which was published as long ago as 1852. This aimed to elucidate the pathology of the kidney by means of the microscope, and was a great advance on anything that had been previously accomplished. When it was written many ways of examining the organ which have since been employed were unknown, and his results were necessarily incomplete, as his methods did little more than reveal the state of the tubes without adequately displaying their interstices. It is characteristic that he adhered to the last to the partial view of renal disease thus indicated, and re-asserted it in a small volume which he issued in the year of his death. He thought that the fibroid increase was not real but only apparent, the appearance being due to the atrophy of the tubes, not to the hypertrophy of what was between them. Whether right or wrong in this matter—and let it be said

that there are still some who think as he thought,—he made at a later date an important observation, as to the broad truth of which no doubt can pertain. He demonstrated the general thickening of the systemic arteries with the chronic granular kidney. This, in my opinion, was the best thing he ever did, and one on which his fame will securely rest. What Johnson advanced was always fated to excite discussion, and this was no exception. He regarded the arterial thickening as purely muscular; Gull and Sutton maintained that it was purely fibroid. The controversy was waged with obstinacy and even with acrimony, but both parties may now sleep in peace,—Johnson in the assurance that his muscular hypertrophy is established beyond question, and the champions of fibrosis with the knowledge that this too is recognised as a truth. At a late period of Johnson's life he frankly admitted to me, in reference to something I had written, that he then recognised the fibroid hypertrophy as well as the muscular. The permanent addition to our knowledge was in the discovery of the arterial thickening; there was room for discussion as to its nature and mode of production.

Together with renal questions, Dr. Johnson was deeply involved in controversy relating to cholera. While Junior Assistant Physician, in 1854, he introduced his castor-oil treatment on eliminative principles, and afterwards superadded a theory of cholera collapse, which he held to be due not to dehydration, but to spasm of the pulmonary arterioles under toxic irritation. It might be urged that thus to add castor oil to the cholera poison was but to give its meed of more to that which had too much; while the hypothesis of pulmonary spasm was not sufficing, since it attributed no part of the result to the changes in the blood necessarily produced by the discharges. As to why the pulmonary vessels, rather than the systemic, should be affected by the spasm, if spasm there be, it would be possible to urge, were one holding a brief for the pulmonary vessels, that if the poison be absorbed from the intestine and conveyed by the portal circulation, the pulmonary

vessels must receive it before the systemic. But this is not the time to discuss, but only to record. These views excited much opposition, which Sir George Johnson neither forgot nor forgave. As in the renal question, so with regard to cholera, he published a final re-assertion of his views just before his death. With this he gave a history of the controversy, in which he spoke of his opponents of forty years before with as much feeling as if they were foes of yesterday. He had none of that philosophy which is content to await the operation of time either to confirm or to correct. He did not resemble another Johnson who used to leave his assailants unnoticed, with the saying, "Depend upon it no man was ever written down but by himself." Beside renal disease and cholera, Johnson became prominent in many other matters, all of which displayed his activity of mind and many his militant temper. He was an early proficient in the use of the laryngoscope. He edited the fifth edition of Watson's inimitable 'Lectures,' and it is not to his discredit that he failed to do what was impossible—maintain the style of the original. Tests for albumen in the urine, the presence of sugar in it in health, the antecedents of Harvey's discovery, all occupied his attention and that of the medical papers. Among other disputations, he became involved in one with Sir W. Gull, on a point of etiquette connected with the Bravo case, which came before the College of Physicians, and was decided in Johnson's favour.

Sir G. Johnson was President of this Society from 1884 to 1886, and was one of the most important of our contributors, not only in number but in interest. Most of his matter which was novel, or involved aught that man may question, was brought in the first instance before this Society. His papers were often productive of others, and of discussion within and without. His opinions, theoretical as they sometimes were, were the result of much labour and thought, and he was apt to regard them as final. Towards those who did not accept his pronouncements his attitude was that of the orthodox in regard to heretics

in the ages of Faith. He brought into science something akin to the *odium theologicum* : here be truths—to reject them is to sin against the light.

In his hospital work he was much esteemed. An eminent physician who was his colleague during the greater part of his career writes thus :—“ He was excellent as a clinical teacher ; was fond of his work, most regular in his attendance in the wards, kind and attentive to the patients, cautious in diagnosis, thoughtful and patient, popular and highly respected by his pupils.”

I have been favoured with a careful estimate of Sir G. Johnson's worth by one who was his colleague in his early days and his friend to the end, one who assisted in his early renal work and witnessed the inception and progress of the cholera controversy. This judicious and accomplished physician—for such he was and is—dwells on Johnson's sympathetic way with the students, his power of enlisting their interest, and of entering into their difficulties ; upon his industry, conscientiousness, scientific spirit, logical faculty and power of expression, together with the ingenuity and inventiveness necessary for original investigation. My informant proceeds to say, “ Of his sincerity and the reality of his convictions, in every case, I have no doubt, and I hardly think that anyone who knew him well could entertain any ; he believed intensely in what he taught, and he had all the courage of his opinions. This was especially apparent in the cholera controversy. That he honestly believed in the success of his treatment, and in the theory of cholera collapse he adopted and so vigorously maintained against all comers, I cannot doubt, and I cannot but admire the courage with which he defended it, single-handed, when it brought upon him a storm of ridicule and censure, and when his most trusted friends were advising him that he had little to gain and much to lose by what he was doing.

“ There is no doubt that he possessed very considerable dialectical skill, and made the most of it. The ingenuity with which he met, and even turned to his own account

his opponents' points, was remarkable. His tenacity of purpose, and readiness to renew the contest on every fresh occasion, were scarcely less so. A controversial atmosphere was certainly not uncongenial to him. It has been suggested that Johnson fought, as the saying is, more for victory than for truth. I do not think so, though I can well understand that the intellectual combativeness to which I have referred may have gone far to produce that impression. It always appeared to me that when he had, often after prolonged investigation, convinced himself of the accuracy of his observations, and had with much thought and ingenuity framed an apparently logical and consistent theory or hypothesis to account for them, this last took so firm a hold on his mind (and the firmer, the more he had to defend it), that he became hardly in a position to estimate at their proper value any presentations of facts or views which might tell against or be irreconcilable with his own. So clear and consequential it all seemed to him, that he could hardly conceive any trained and intelligent person not seeing as he did, and had small patience, therefore, with some who thought and saw differently."

Sir George Johnson gave almost his whole mind to his profession. He had few interests outside it, though it may be mentioned that he was a keen sportsman, especially in the way of deer-stalking, in which he was successful even in his later days, when he suffered from paralysis agitans, an affliction which might have been thought to interfere with his skill as a marksman.

Sir George Johnson's tall and dignified figure, his handsome face and courteous manners, will long be remembered in this Society, while his works will claim attention long after his personality has been forgotten. His earnest, strenuous, and honorable life must ever command admiration and respect. What he did, and what he tried to do, the impetus which he gave to research, and the discussions of which he was the centre, have permanently modified the knowledge of his time, and will be

ever remembered in the medical history of the latter half of the nineteenth century.

He died on the 3rd of last June of an apoplectic attack which had seized him on the 1st. He lived his life to the last, and concluded it without suffering. With failing health and trembling fingers he stood to his guns to the last. On the morning of his fatal attack he had been characteristically, and probably happily, employed in writing a controversial article on cholera.

Dr. Charles Henry Ralfe, the son of a naval officer, was born in 1842. He received his medical education at the Bath United Hospital and King's College, London. After having been House Surgeon at the Lock, he entered at Caius College, Cambridge, and graduated with honours in Natural Science. He first came before the public as a general practitioner at Doncaster, but in 1869 he established himself as a physician in London. He soon obtained the appointment of Registrar at Charing Cross, and availed himself of the opportunities there afforded to work at Physiological Chemistry. His labours bore fruit in 1873 in the shape of a small but useful handbook on that subject. Shortly after this he became attached to St. George's Hospital as Demonstrator of Physiological Chemistry, and to the Seamen's Hospital at Greenwich as Physician. He used his special knowledge and his clinical opportunities in the investigation of scurvy, a disease which cannot be said, as yet, to have given up its secret, but which Dr. Ralfe threw light upon in pointing out the deficiency in it, not only of potash, but of the alkaline phosphates. He left St. George's and Greenwich on becoming in 1880 Assistant Physician to the London Hospital, which he continued to be until within a few months of his death.

On his resignation in consequence of failing health he was created Consulting Physician, I believe an unprecedented honour for an assistant. At the London Hospital Dr. Ralfe had given voluntary lectures on Physiological Chemistry, and had also lectured on Public Health. He was

useful in the School, popular with the students, esteemed and trusted by his colleagues, as it was his happiness always to be wherever he found them. Among these I may count myself, for I was associated with him when he taught at St. George's, and, at that time, acquired a liking and respect for him which endured to the end of his life.

Besides the work I have referred to Dr. Ralfe was the author of several others on cognate subjects, one on Clinical Chemistry, one on Urinary Pathology, and a more comprehensive treatise on Diseases of the Kidney. He contributed nothing to our 'Transactions,' but held the offices of Councillor and Referee. At the Pathological he was more active than with us; he frequently took part in the meetings as exhibitor and otherwise, and was a member of the Committee on Morbid Growths, and also of that on Pyæmia.

Dr. Ralfe died of phthisis, sequent on diabetes, on the 26th of last June, at the age of fifty-four. He was a type of the best kind of physician. He used his opportunities for advancing knowledge with ability and success, and without the purpose of an advertiser. He was cultivated and well-read, upright and honorable, kindly and personally attractive. His loss will be regretted by all who knew him.

Thomas O'Connor, of March, Cambridgeshire, died on the 7th of last July, at the age of eighty-three. He had an extensive general practice about this place, where he had been for more than half a century. He was devoted to his professional work, and throughout the fen country, I am told, his name was a household word. He was a man of excellent ability; he was a good classical scholar, and amid the distractions of country practice fitted himself for the Fellowship of the College of Surgeons. He was the author of several papers which are published in the 'British Medical Journal,' notably one upon ergot. He was hospitable and genial, and his society was much appreciated by his medical neighbours.

Dr. Alfred Thomas Brett, of Watford, was more than a

local practitioner ; he was, latterly at least, something of a public character. He was well known in Watford and Hertfordshire, not only in medical practice, but in connection with many matters of general interest and utility outside the profession of medicine. He was a local leader in all that concerned education and public health. He was actively associated in Watford with the Public Library, the Natural History Society, and the Endowed Schools, and held many appointments in the town, medical and non-medical, which are too numerous to name. He was a member of the Hertford County Council. He was prominent in connection with the British Medical Association, and with the Association of the Medical Officers of Public Schools. Within the latter society I often met him. He presented himself to me as one of a sort of which there are not too many. He was a doctor, and more than a doctor—a man whose wide sympathies and numerous points of contact with his fellow-townsmen and fellow-workers could not fail to extend the respect which pertained to his calling. Our profession is an engrossing one, and often occupies our thoughts to the exclusion of social demands and public interests. Dr. Brett was full of what may be termed local patriotism, and did what he could—and that was much—to benefit with the widest scope the community among which his lot was cast.

He died of Bright's disease on July 11th, 1896, at the age of sixty-eight.

In the death of *Dr. Henry Moore Bowman* a life of great promise was extinguished. Dr. Bowman was born in Westmoreland, and educated partly by his father, a clergyman, and partly by the natural objects which formed his surroundings. His professional instruction was received at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, where he was distinguished as a student, as he also was at the University of London. He was the author of several papers, one of which on "Diseases of the Spinal Cord," published in 'Brain,' deserves especial mention. At the time of his death he held the offices of Assistant Demonstrator of

Physiology and Pharmacy at St. Bartholomew's, and of Assistant Physician to the Royal Hospital for Diseases of the Chest.

He was, as I learn, a man of much thoroughness and accuracy, popular and successful as a teacher, and one to whom those who came within his scope were much attached. Had he lived a great deal might have been expected of him.

His end was sudden and unexpected. Having retired to rest in his usual health, he was found dead in his bed on the morning of July 17th of last year. The heart was found to be dilated and degenerated. He died at the age of thirty-one.

Peter Yeames Gowlland, whose decease I have now to refer to, was best known as for many years Senior Surgeon to St. Mark's Hospital for Fistula.

He was born in Kent in the year 1825, of a naval family. His father was a captain in the Royal Navy, of fighting renown, and his mother was the sister of naval officers. Mr. Gowlland received his medical education at the London Hospital, where he held the offices of House Surgeon, Demonstrator of Anatomy, Assistant Surgeon, and Lecturer on Anatomy. He was very successful as Demonstrator, and was assisted in that capacity by very considerable artistic facility. He seems to have been very popular among his hospital patients. He found his life's work at St. Mark's Hospital, soon after his election to which he quitted the London, and gave himself up to the speciality with which he had become associated. In this he soon obtained a considerable practice. His surgical ability is highly spoken of by those able to judge of it, and he was regarded as conscientious, painstaking, kind, and unselfish. He was an honest man, and deservedly trusted by those who sought his skill. Though not known as a writer he had much literary taste. He was a sportsman in many departments, and, I believe, was eminent as a fisherman.

Five years before his death he left Finsbury Square, where he had practised for forty years, and afterwards lived in partial retirement. He died on August 11th,

1896, of uræmic coma. He leaves the reputation of an upright man and a judicious and skilful surgeon.

Of *Paul Jackson*, though a resident in London, it is strange to say that I can learn little excepting that he was a Fellow of this Society for fifty-six years. He was a student at the Westminster Hospital. He practised formerly in Thayer Street, Manchester Square, and latterly lived in the Wellington Road, where he died on the 4th of last September at the age of eighty-two. He had long retired from work. I am told that his patients placed great confidence in him, but beyond that I have received no information.

John Jones Merriman was a type of the highest class of general practitioner. He was greatly respected medically and socially, and did much to enhance the respect due to his calling. He was the third lineal representative of a medical firm which existed at Kensington for 110 years under the name of John Merriman. Like others of his family he was educated at St. George's Hospital, where his course as a student was not without distinction. He was, like his father, associated with the Kensington Dispensary, of which he was an active supporter.

In 1853 he was appointed surgeon to the household of the Duchess of Teck, and latterly became general medical attendant to the Duke and Duchess. He retired to Worthing in 1894, where he died on the 8th of September, 1896, in his seventieth year.

His life was one of unobtrusive usefulness and unblemished honour. He leaves behind him no more worthy member of the branch of the profession to which he belonged.

Sir John Eric Erichsen was of mixed race,—his father a Dane, his mother English. He was born at Copenhagen in the year 1818, and was educated in England, mainly at University College. As a pupil of Sir Robert Carswell he was early indoctrinated with pathology. Soon after the completion of his studentship, which comprised a course of study in Paris, he was appointed Lecturer on

Physiology at the Westminster Hospital. His attainments in this science led to his appointment as Secretary to the Physiological Section of the British Association in the year 1844, and his selection, in conjunction with Professor Sharpey, to inquire experimentally into the process of asphyxia. His researches in this matter were rewarded by the Fothergillian Gold Medal of the Royal Humane Society. In the year 1848 he sought and obtained the post of Assistant Surgeon at University College, and two years later he found himself full Surgeon and Professor of Surgery. His rapid rise on the staff was due to causes with which he had nothing to do—the various quarrels and resignations which followed the death of Liston. His promotion to the Chair of Surgery may be taken as a testimony to the reputation he had acquired at the age of thirty-two. It has been said that in revolutions men live fast; and Mr. Erichsen's professional course was accelerated by the dissensions among which his lot was cast. In the year 1853 he published his great work on 'The Science and Art of Surgery,' which went through many editions, has been translated into many languages, has been re-edited by younger men, and still holds its place as perhaps the best text-book on surgery, certainly the most popular. The estimation in which it was held at the time of the Civil War in America was shown by the fact that the Federal Government had it reprinted and distributed to every surgeon in its service. However the Northern States may have profited from this dissemination of useful knowledge, it is said that neither the author nor the publisher derived any advantage from it. This work did much to establish the position and secure the practice of the writer in general surgery. He was the author of others which drew to him business of a special, and perhaps not of the most desirable kind. These were entitled 'Railway Injuries of the Nervous System' and 'Concussion of the Spine.' The term "railway spine" was of his invention. These publications placed him in the position of a recognised scientific

witness in railway cases. He was employed sometimes by those who sustained injuries, sometimes by those who inflicted them. I have no reason to suppose that he was necessarily biassed in favour of the side by which he was retained, but the situation is an unsatisfactory one, since it tends to make a man an advocate when he should be a judge. The scientific witness should be the servant of the court, not of the litigant; his object should be to promote justice, not to maintain a cause.

To trace his later course in detail would be little more than to register a series of honours. He filled most of the responsible offices at the College of Surgeons, culminating with that of President, which he attained in the year 1880. When placed upon the Council he was an ardent reformer, but, what is not uncommon, he became less liberal when in office. At the College he displayed, as I am assured by Mr. Trimmer, much business capacity. At the Parliamentary election of 1885 he became a candidate, in the Liberal interest, for the seat now so worthily occupied by Sir W. Priestley, that of the United Universities of Edinburgh and Aberdeen. Whether to his advantage or the contrary, he was unsuccessful. He served on the Royal Commission on Vaccination, was made Surgeon Extraordinary to the Queen, and was chosen as President of University College, an honour the greater because not necessarily conferred upon a member of the medical profession. His immediate predecessor was the Earl of Kimberley. He was created a baronet early in 1895, and died in September, 1896, at the age of seventy-eight, full of years and honours, and regretted by a wide circle of friends. His death occurred at Folkestone, after a paralytic seizure which supervened upon symptoms of angina.

Mr. Erichsen, as he then was, was President of this Society in the years 1879-80, and filled the office with the efficiency and dignity which were characteristic of him; but his contributions to the 'Transactions' were but two in number, and those of no great value.

Erichsen must be regarded as an eminently successful

man, and success is the stamp of the world's approval. It is true he was fortunate, circumstances worked for him; but at least he was able to avail himself of his opportunities, and to fill with acceptance the high place to which he succeeded. He owed his success to a happy combination of good qualities rather than to pre-eminence in one. I cannot learn that he ever did anything to advance the science of surgery. If he was more skilful than others in the practice of it, it was not in the manipulative parts. He was, as I learn, good in diagnosis and judicious in advice; not so good as an operator by reason of his defective sight. One of his great merits, as I am assured by an eminent member of his own school, was his continual readiness to accept and embody the surgical advances of younger men. He was, says one who knew him well, "a man of good abilities, a good example of the average London hospital surgeon." This verdict applies only to the practical surgeon; he must have had much more in him than practical surgery to have been supremely successful as a writer, and to have become at last President of University College. His clinical lectures, I am told, were more remarkable for elegance of language than profundity of thought. A great writer on surgery, not unknown within these walls, thus speaks of Erichsen.

After referring to his book as the chief surgical textbook in the English language, and one which has been translated into most of the languages of the civilised world, he adds, "This was in itself a great achievement, and will long secure for him a high place in surgical literature; but Sir John Erichsen was more than an author. He was a distinguished teacher in a school where many great surgeons had preceded him, and he showed himself capable of carrying on their traditions and filling the chair once occupied by Liston and Syme, and he held down to nearly the time of his death a leading position in London. He was not, it is true, one of those who mark out the path for themselves, and who lead the way to fresh conquests in the domain of surgery. But he possessed a

judgment which, in clinical questions at least, was sound and enlightened by long experience, a great talent for administration, wise and weighty eloquence, dignity of presence, and elevation of view. Hence he was well fitted for the leading position in a great school of surgery. Outside clinical surgery his judgment was not so trustworthy." My correspondent instances, as showing want of judgment, Erichsen's tract on 'Hospitalism,' in which he advocated the destruction of existing hospitals as "pyæmia-stricken," and the substitution of temporary constructions. But the adoption of Lister's methods has done away with this necessity, if it ever existed, and we may exult in the accomplishments of the present while we sympathise with the endeavours of the past. Nor does my correspondent consider that Sir John Erichsen's reputation derived much benefit from his writings on the subject of Railway Injuries, or from the acrimonious style of controversy which he adopted when his doctrines on this subject were challenged.

Sir John Erichsen had qualities which would have served him well in any way of life. Among other useful gifts he was a ready and fluent speaker, and could effectively support the opinions he held. His genial and kindly nature secured to him the attachment of all with whom he was brought into contact, and made him widely popular. He took great interest in those who worked under him, and was always ready to lend a helping hand to those who needed it. As long as his personality is remembered, it will be with feelings of affection and respect.

The life of *Sir George Murray Humphry* was a remarkable one. Beginning as a general practitioner without a practice, imperfectly educated, poor and unfriended, he became the most influential man in the University of Cambridge, converted an insignificant Medical School into one of the greatest in the world, and left behind him a transformation which promises to endure as long as any part of our present University system. He found a school

rather select than numerous ; he left one rather numerous than select. Where half a dozen men at their fullest muster walked the hospital with the Professor of Physic ; where physiology was untaught, and of the other sciences on which medicine is founded, the only one in which the University provided adequate instruction was botany, there is now, owing to the efforts of Sir George Humphry and Sir George Paget, a school of medicine which numbers about 300 entries a year, and which in the teaching of the fundamental sciences has no equal in England and no superior anywhere.

Mr. Humphry, not to anticipate his later designations, was born in 1820 at Sudbury, in Suffolk, and after a local education was, at the age of sixteen, apprenticed to Crosse of Norwich, and no doubt employed in the subordinate parts of surgery and general practice. In 1839 he proceeded to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, and after having gained a gold medal in Anatomy at the University of London, passed the College and Hall, and became legally qualified to practise at the age of twenty-two. In the same year he was, through the influence of Mr. Paget, then Curator of the Museum, elected surgeon to Addenbrooke's Hospital, where Dr. Paget, the brother of the surgeon, was on the staff. Mr. Humphry had never been House Surgeon or Demonstrator, and had but recently completed his third year at St. Bartholomew's when he thus found himself a hospital surgeon with the responsibility of capital operations. When he reached Cambridge he must have had much to learn, and it may be added that he had everything to earn. I am told that he had to borrow a small sum wherewith to purchase a horse which was to carry him on his daily rounds. He soon acquired a considerable general practice in and about Cambridge, and attached to his horse a dog-cart, on the back seat of which he used to crouch, protected, as well as might be, from the wind and rain. On his appointment to the hospital he and Dr. Paget obtained the permission of the Governors to give Clinical Lectures, which hitherto had

not been done, and Humphry delivered in addition systematic lectures on Surgery, a course of which was published in the 'Provincial Medical Journal.' In the year 1847 Dr. Clark, Professor of Human and Comparative Anatomy, made over to Humphry, as his assistant, the portion relating to the human subject. Accepted as a University lecturer, Humphry now entered at Downing, and became a University student. Some years afterwards I had the privilege of attending his lectures on the bones. These were the finest lectures on human anatomy I ever heard. The only discourses which could compare with them were those by Owen, at the College of Surgeons, on Comparative Anatomy. Humphry brought to bear upon his limited subject a wealth of illustration drawn from comparative anatomy and physiology, and a breadth of philosophic thought which made those dry bones live as if they had been revived by some miraculous touch.

While thus lecturing for Professor Clark, Humphry brought out his great book on the Skeleton, which was one of much labour and originality, and at once procured for him the Fellowship of the Royal Society. Between his arrival at Cambridge in 1842 and the appearance of his book in 1858, he must have done an amount of work of which few would have been capable. In the first place he had to maintain himself by a laborious and ill-paid general practice. During part of this time he had to prepare for University examinations in Arts and Medicine. Not only did he perform the ordinary duties of a hospital surgeon with more than ordinary energy, but he gave two courses of lectures annually, at first clinical and surgical, latterly clinical and anatomical. In addition he found time to produce the treatise to which I have referred, and make the numerous observations and dissections upon which it is based. All this he did under the frequent embarrassment of ill-health, for he was never physically strong. On the resignation of Dr. Clark in 1866, human anatomy was separated from comparative, and the Professorship of the former assigned to Humphry.

This he retained until 1883, when he resigned it, with its emoluments, in order to become Professor of Surgery without stipend, a generous act which helped to further the great object of his life, and bring nearer to completeness the Medical School of Cambridge.

He had long been gradually emerging from miscellaneous practice, and now held the position of the chief consulting and operating surgeon in Cambridge and its neighbourhood. His lectures as deputy had done much to popularise the study of medicine in the University, and as Professor he bent all his energies towards what was virtually the great work of his life, the development of the Medical School. It was owing to his influence that the Cambridge School was completely recognised by the College of Surgeons. In 1859 the Cambridge Anatomy was partially recognised, Medicine and Surgery not at all. When he became Lecturer on Surgery, the Cambridge teaching on Anatomy, Medicine, and Surgery obtained complete recognition, and the University was placed on a level as regards the College of Surgeons with the other great Medical Schools. He was active in getting the Colleges to admit the claims of Natural Science, and in demonstrating to the profession the comparative inexpensiveness of a University medical education. He took a leading part in the construction of the new school buildings, and in the establishment of the Museum, and was helpful in the foundation of the Professorships of Physiology and Pathology. While giving his due to Humphry the name of Sir George Paget must not be passed without grateful recognition, for what he did towards effecting the great transformation. As to the Museum, this was Humphry's hobby. He spent much time in it and much money upon it, and sought material far and wide. If he ever were unscrupulous it was in the acquisition of pathological specimens,—a form of immorality by which other collections beside that at Cambridge have been enriched.

It is unnecessary to follow his later career in detail.

He acquired, or had thrust upon him, almost all the honours possible in his position. He became a member of Council and examiner at the College of Surgeons, and would have been made Vice-President and President had he not thought these offices incompatible with his Cambridge work. He for a time represented the University on the Medical Council. He was President of the British Medical Association in 1881, President of the Pathological Society of London in 1891. He was made an Honorary Fellow of Downing, and a Professorial Fellow of King's. He received titles of honour from many universities, and gave many lectures and addresses at the instance of various learned bodies. In 1891 he received the honour of knighthood, but of all the designations to which he was entitled the one in which he took most pleasure was, as he once told me, that of Professor.

As an author Humphry was remarkable both for quality and quantity. All he wrote was good, and there was much of it. Beside his book on 'The Human Skeleton,' he wrote one on 'The Limbs of Vertebrate Animals,' and another on 'The Human Hand and Foot.' He was the author of a small treatise on the coagulation of blood in the venous system, a subject in which he had had painful experience, and also of a small volume on 'Old Age.' To our own 'Transactions' he gave nine papers, and therefore was among our most prolific contributors. I need make no mention of his minor publications, which were too numerous to recapitulate, but I must not omit to mention that he was editor of the 'Journal of Anatomy.'

Of Humphry as a surgeon it scarcely becomes me to speak. When I attended the Addenbrooke he was very busy excising knees, in which he took particular delight. We students, as youthful and confident critics, used to think that he sometimes performed this operation when it might have been avoided; and patients on admission were known to say, "Now, Dr. Humphry, I am not going to have my knee took out." But I will quit my

personal recollections, which are worth little, for the more valuable testimony of others.

A great surgical authority thus writes of Humphry :—
“ He was a good and successful surgeon. Part of his success was no doubt due, as he himself with becoming modesty pointed out, to the fact that his hospital practice lay mainly among agriculturists, with constitutions untainted by the debauchery and excitements of town life ; but those who followed his practice were best able to judge how large a part of it was due to his own care, ingenuity, and good judgment. How well planned his operations were, and how well his patients recovered, is shown by the fact that in those pre-antiseptic days many, if not most of the wounds were left simply exposed to the air, and healed kindly, without any dressing whatever. His worth as a surgeon can be well appreciated by a perusal of the nine contributions which he made to the ‘Medico-Chirurgical Transactions.’ Humphry was one of the chief operators, after Fergusson, who advocated and extensively practised excision of the knee. His papers in our ‘Transactions’ (vols. xli and lii) had a powerful influence in recommending an operation which was at that time unduly decried by its opponents, as it was unduly exalted by its partisans—for Humphry writes not as a partisan (in fact, he was, he says, at first prejudiced against excision), and he makes no exaggerated claims for it ; but he shows by unanswerable results the good which it may do in appropriate cases. His practice was criticised at the time, and he was thought by some to have used the operation too indiscriminately ; but a careful perusal of these papers would, I think, modify this judgment.” My correspondent refers to a paper of Humphry’s in vol. lxii of our ‘Transactions,’ as showing that he was the first English surgeon who successfully removed a tumour from the male bladder, and also that he then saw how much advantage might in many cases be derived from the supra-pubic method. My correspondent adduces Humphry’s last contributions to our

'Transactions' in 1890 and 1891 as marked by wide research, and as showing that age and success had not checked his ardour or diminished his interest in the pursuit of knowledge.

Humphry had a great contempt for what he called "messes"—various ointments and lotions which used to be applied to newly made wounds; his principle was to do what he had to do, and then leave the parts alone. He never took kindly to antiseptic surgery.

Humphry's personality will long be remembered. Who that knew him can forget his attenuated figure, his lean and starved look, his keen black eyes, and his hair as straight, and to the last as black, as the plumage of a raven? There was a fascination in his glance, so piercing and so inquiring; like Cassius, he seemed to look quite through the deeds of men. His consuming energy, his active mind, and his feeble frame irresistibly recall the description of the fiery soul which "o'er-informed the tenement of clay." He had no amusements, or rather his only amusement was travelling, and even with that his chief attraction was the hospitals and museums. He was penurious in all that concerned his own indulgence; but he was hospitable, and in large matters profusely generous. Having begun poor, he ended rich. All he became possessed of was the result of his own industry, and was made chiefly by the multiplication of small fees. Humphry was full of resource, and generally succeeded in getting his own way, whatever it was,—a measure of success which did not endear him to those who thought differently. But his aims were generally unselfish; they were seldom personal, but were directed to the development of the Medical School and the good of the profession.

He died at the age of seventy-six, of cancer of the bowel, having nearly to the last retained his customary interests and many of his customary occupations.

Dr. John Haydon Langdon Down was born in the year 1828, in the village of Antony St. Jacob, in Cornwall, where his father practised as apothecary. At the age of

eighteen he became a student at the Pharmaceutical Society in Bloomsbury Square, and there became proficient in botany and materia medica, and distinguished in chemistry. At the age of twenty-five he entered at the London Hospital, where, and at the University of London, his career was successful and even brilliant.

In 1858, having now passed the College and Hall, he was elected Medical Superintendent of the Earlswood Asylum, and there was introduced to what proved to be the work of his life. In 1859, now M.B. and a Member of the College of Physicians, he was appointed Assistant Physician to the London Hospital, the duties of which post were not held to be incompatible with residence at Earlswood. In the year 1868 he founded an Idiot Asylum of his own at Hampton Wick, under the name of Normansfield, which gradually assumed large dimensions, and where great numbers of the imbecile offspring of the upper classes were lodged and treated with profit, I dare say to themselves, certainly to the proprietor. With the responsibility of this great commercial undertaking, Dr. Langdon Down retained his position at the London Hospital, and was helpful in the School as Lecturer successively on Comparative Anatomy, Materia Medica, and Medicine. He duly rose on the staff until 1890, when he was, in fulness of time, eliminated as Consulting Physician. He thus lived a divided life, and "contrived a double debt to pay." The successful management of the Asylum was, I believe, largely due to Mrs. Langdon Down, and Dr. Langdon Down was enabled to perform his hospital duties without reproach, and even with credit. I learn from one of his colleagues that he was most punctual and conscientious in his hospital work, and much trusted and respected by those who worked with him.

In our Society he was Vice-President in 1890-91, and he gave two papers to our 'Transactions,' both bearing on "Congenital Deficiencies of the Brain." He was not a voluminous writer, but when he wrote it was generally with approval. He made nine contributions to the 'Patho-

logical Transactions.' He was the author of 'An Ethnological Classification of Idiots,' of 'Observations on the Mouth and Teeth in Idiocy,' of 'A Course of Lettsomian Lectures on the Mental Affections of Childhood and Youth,' and of other less considerable papers, mostly bearing on similar subjects. Dr. Langdon Down became old prematurely; in his latter years, though only sixty-eight when he died, his failure both of body and mind was conspicuous. His death, which was sudden, occurred at Earlsfield on October the 7th of last year.

Dr. Langdon Down was strikingly handsome. If, as has been said, "to be a well-favoured man is the gift of Fortune," this was the only respect in which Fortune favoured him. In early life he was poor, and owed everything he became possessed of to his own exertions.

Enough has been said to show that he was a man of high character, of much ability, industry, and power of organisation; one who might have done something considerable as a physician, had he not been encumbered with a pursuit in which medicine took only a subordinate part.

I approach the life of *Dr. George Harley* with a double duty; to do justice to his great gifts, and not to ignore his small failings. In him considerable talents and indomitable energy found expression in an enthusiastic assertiveness which did not always display them to advantage. His success was further hindered by disease, which cost him his hospital appointment, and in one shape or another accompanied him through the greater part of his life. The physical difficulties he had to contend against would have been insuperable to most men, but with him were to a great extent counterbalanced by his elastic and energetic temperament, and his determination not to be overcome. All who witnessed it must have admired the victorious struggle of mind over body, of mental force over physical failure.

Dr. Harley's life may be briefly related; his writings, adequately to consider them, would occupy a longer time than I can venture to devote to them. He was born at

Haddington, educated there and at the University of Edinburgh, and retained the characteristics of a Scotchman all his life. On leaving Edinburgh he went to Paris, and there worked for two years in the physiological and chemical laboratories of that city, and was there honoured with the Presidency of the Parisian Medical Society. While in Paris he discovered the presence of iron in the colouring matter of the urine, a discovery which was at first disputed, afterwards accepted. He spent the next two years at the German universities, under the direction, among others, of Liebig, Kölliker, and Virchow. He thus had a prolonged and complete scientific education, such as falls to the lot of but few. He devoted to physiology and chemistry four years, which most men with similar aims employ in gaining hospital experience in junior appointments. Almost immediately upon reaching London, on the conclusion of his foreign studies, he obtained the post of Curator at University College, then that of Lecturer on Practical Physiology and Histology, then that of Professor of Medical Jurisprudence, and finally that of Physician to the Hospital, which office was conferred upon him in 1861. In 1864 he presented to the Royal Society an elaborate research on the chemistry of respiration, which was rewarded with the Fellowship.

His career was interrupted by an accident which cost him two years of professional life and his hospital position. While working with the microscope as Demonstrator of Histology a vessel gave way in the left retina. This was followed by retinitis and glaucoma in the left eye, and sympathetic inflammation in the right. He was advised to submit to excision of the eye primarily affected, but reasoning as a physiologist rather than as a surgeon, he determined to have recourse to functional rest, to which end he shut himself up in a dark room for nine months, and came out with his eyes restored. This does not complete the tale of Dr. Harley's bodily impairments. He had been subject to gout from the age of sixteen; twenty-two years ago, after a tour through Lapland and

Russia, he was attacked with what was called rheumatic gout, which left him weak in the legs. Soon afterwards he fell down and broke the lower end of one fibula, which never properly united. But his power of walking remained more imperfect than this accident could explain, and it was thought by some that he had become the subject of locomotor ataxy. After death it was found that the paraplegic symptoms were due to pressure on the cord in connection with two carious lumbar vertebræ. How few men with such a record of ill-health would have done as much as Dr. Harley accomplished! Even within his dark chamber he dictated, through a partition, a book which was published and approved of.

Dr. Harley's bent was scientific rather than clinical, but he nevertheless was practically active, especially in regard to affections of the liver. But he by no means limited himself to this organ. Indeed, so numerous and so various were his topics that he was one of the most diligent inquirers, and one of the most productive writers of his time. Some of his best observations were upon the urine. So great was his range, including anthropology and spelling, that I cannot do more than bestow a passing touch on the more prominent of his performances. In the early sixties he was active at the Pathological Society, and was frequently selected as a referee when special skill in chemistry or microscopy was wanted. He strenuously controverted the views of Addison with regard to the supra-renal bodies, and brought forward observations and experiments to show that these organs might become diseased or be removed without any noticeable symptom. He justified his claim to speak with knowledge on this matter by obtaining in 1862 the Astley Cooper Prize, which for this year had reference to the structures in question. One of the most valuable of Harley's observations was, in my judgment, that upon Intermittent Hæmaturia, which was brought before this Society in 1865. Dr. Harley was the first to note the destruction of the blood-corpuscles in this condition, and the appearance

in the urine of the products of their disintegration, and thus to differentiate between this and other kinds of hæmaturia. He, however, attributed the disorder to hepatic disturbance, instead of, as was suggested at the time, and has since been generally accepted, to changes originating in the blood itself, or at least occurring there as the direct result of the malarial action. Dr. Harley's *magnum opus* in every sense was his work on 'Diseases of the Liver.' Of this it may be said that it would have been a greater book had it been a smaller one. Like everything he wrote, it is full of learning and research; but it is expanded with details, some of which might have been well omitted. Like his conversation, it is didactic and somewhat egotistical.

With regard to our Society, Dr. Harley, beside contributing the paper which has been referred to, served on three scientific committees, and held the office of Vice-President.

It may be said of him in final retrospect that few have done as much under so great disadvantages.

He died quite suddenly on the 27th of last October, in a manner which may be envied, from rupture of a coronary artery and hæmorrhage into the pericardium.

William Edward Stewart was probably better known to many of the Fellows of this Society than to me. He was born in 1821, and educated medically at University College Hospital. His working life was spent in general practice, first in Weymouth Street, latterly in Harley Street. He held several appointments in connection with benevolent institutions; he was Surgeon to the Marylebone Provident Dispensary, to St. Elizabeth's Home in Mortimer Street, and to the Trinity Home and Residence for Governesses; he was Medical Attendant to the Establishment for Gentlewomen during Illness, where he worked for some time with Miss Florence Nightingale.

In 1894 his failing health compelled him to leave London for Brighton, where his death occurred suddenly in November, 1896.

Dr. George Augustus Frederick Wilks was born in 1811. He was educated medically at Edinburgh, where he graduated. After studying in Paris he came to London and lectured on botany and materia medica, first at the Charlotte School of Medicine (about which school I have no information), and afterwards at St. Thomas's Hospital. He retired from practice in 1849, and after a few years went to Torquay, where he remained until his death. He was a prominent member of the Torquay Natural History Society, and was known as an author. He wrote a historical work on the Popes, and several essays on scientific subjects, mostly in opposition to the Darwinian theory.

He died on the 22nd of last December.

William F. Butt was well known, highly respected, and much employed as a general practitioner in Park Street, Grosvenor Square. Some years ago I used frequently to meet him socially, and, like most who knew him, held him in much esteem.

He was born at Gloucester in the year 1834. He received his medical education at the London Hospital. About five years ago his health broke down, in consequence, as was thought, of overwork, and he had to give up practice.

He died on the 15th of last January after a few days' illness.

Dr. Edward Ballard was one of a select class of men who render great service to the public, but are little recognised by them. The causes and prevention of disease occupied him rather than its cure.

He was born and bred at Islington, where a large part of his life's work was performed. University College was his *alma mater*, and the University of London the place of his graduation. At both he was distinguished. Early in life he became Physician to the St. Pancras Royal Dispensary, where he had as colleagues Dr. (now Sir Henry) Pitman, and the late Dr. A. P. Stewart. Later he became Lecturer on Medicine at the Grosvenor Place School, a private establishment belonging to the late Mr. Lane,

which was ultimately absorbed into the School of St. Mary's Hospital. The course of Dr. Ballard's life and his field of usefulness were determined in 1856, when he was elected Officer of Health for Islington on the creation of the office which he held. He retained this appointment together with private practice for sixteen years, at the end of which time he renounced both for the service of the Local Government Board, the Privy Council, and Sir John Simon. He received the Fellowship of the College of Physicians in 1872, and that of the Royal Society in 1889.

Before he became specialised he wrote a book on 'The Physical Diagnosis of Diseases of the Abdomen,' and another on 'Materia Medica and Therapeutics.' He was the author of many papers, five of which are in our own 'Transactions,' of a Prize Essay on Vaccination, and of many contributions to the science of public health. It was in connection with the latter that his most noteworthy work was done. He is believed to have been the first to trace the infection of typhoid to milk. He investigated an outbreak of diphtheria at Islington, the adulteration of butter with animal fats, trade effluvium nuisances, and the causation of summer diarrhoea. The last inquiry was his most extensive and laborious, and he was occupied upon it within a few days of his death.

He died on January 19th of this year, at the age of seventy-six, after a brief illness from bronchitis.

I cannot conclude this inadequate notice better than in the words of Sir John Simon: "My impression is that in times long after our own Dr. Ballard will be recorded as one of the chief confirmers and extenders of the sanitary science of his age."

The name of *Sir Thomas Spencer Wells* will ever be remembered in the history of the surgery of the nineteenth century. Though he was by no means a man of one idea, or a surgeon of one operation, yet, as is well known in this Society, it is upon one operation that his fame rests.

He was born at Hertford in 1818. He learned the rudiments of his profession from a general practitioner at

Barnsley, and afterwards became unqualified assistant to a parish doctor at Leeds. Here he was admitted to the lectures and the practice of the great school of surgery in this town, and in later life looked back with gratitude to the teaching of the second Hey and the elder Teale. From Leeds he proceeded to Trinity College, Dublin, and thence to St. Thomas's Hospital. On passing the College he entered the navy as assistant surgeon, and for nearly six years did duty in the Naval Hospital at Malta. He then left the navy, and after an interlude in Paris set up in London. In 1854 he became Surgeon to the Samaritan Free Hospital for Women and Children, then an institution of no great pretensions, in Seymour Street. Spencer Wells while in Paris had discussed the operation of ovariectomy with Dr. Waters, afterwards of Chester, but never witnessed its performance until, in the year of his becoming connected with the Samaritan Hospital, he saw it done by Mr. Baker Brown with, as was usual at that date, a fatal result. Not yet did Spencer Wells enter upon his destined path. In the same year, on the outbreak of the Crimean war, he temporarily resumed his position as a naval surgeon, and in that capacity proceeded to the East. In 1857, the year following his return, he was made Lecturer on Surgery at Lane's School, known as the School of Medicine, adjoining St. George's Hospital. At about the same time he became editor of the 'Medical Times and Gazette,' which post he retained for seven years. In the same year he made his first attempt in the speciality to which his future life was chiefly devoted. This was unsuccessful, but was followed in 1858 by a successful operation of the same kind. From this time for many years Spencer Wells was the accepted ovariectomist. He operated with a previously unknown average of success, though of late years, owing to the introduction of antiseptic methods, his average has been greatly improved upon. In our 'Transactions' for 1863 he published an account of his first 50 cases with, to apply justly a now discredited word, 33

cures. In a later volume, that for 1881, he gave a *résumé* of 1000 cases with 769 recoveries. Thus the earlier series gave 66 per cent. as the proportion of recovery, the entire series a proportion of 76 per cent. Spencer Wells had at first to encounter much opposition. The operation was passionately denounced by Dr. Robert Lee, and looking at its results before the time of Spencer Wells, the attitude of that honest and humane, if somewhat conservative physician was not unjustifiable. Dr. West, who had formerly been an opponent of the operation, became a supporter of it as performed by Spencer Wells.

The fame of Spencer Wells was enhanced by a book on 'Diseases of the Ovaries' which he published in 1865, which was modified and republished, and took its final shape in 1882 under the title of 'Ovarian and Uterine Tumours; their Diagnosis and Treatment.' This was translated into many languages, and acquired a more than European reputation. As a writer Sir Spencer Wells was clear and forcible. Though not a fluent or eloquent speaker, he could speak with effect when he had anything to say, which was as often as he rose to speak.

Honours and wealth accumulated. He was made Surgeon in Ordinary to the Household. He became President of the College of Surgeons in 1882, and a baronet in the succeeding year. He was made Foreign Associate of the Academy of Medicine of Paris, and received titles of honour from the Kings and Queens' College of Physicians of Ireland, and the Universities of Leyden, Bologna, and Charkof, and was made a Knight Commander of the Norwegian Order of St. Olaf. In our own Society he was Vice-President in 1881, and he contributed to our 'Transactions' as many as fourteen papers.

Sir Spencer Wells had an attack of influenza three years ago when travelling in India, after which paralytic symptoms slowly developed, and his broken health became painfully apparent. He was nevertheless able to attend the dinner of the Society on the 28th of last November,

and displayed gratification when some allusion was made to his ovarian exploits. Two months ago he went to the south of France. On the 31st of January, at Cap d'Antibes, he had an apoplectic seizure which proved fatal in twelve hours. He died three days before his seventy-ninth birthday.

An eminent surgeon, to whom I have more than once had to confess my obligations, thus writes of Sir Spencer Wells:—"As a surgeon Spencer Wells must in any ordinary circumstances have achieved distinction, for he had the love of his calling, the prudent boldness, and the capacity for careful attention to detail, which are the chief requisites for success. He had also seen much of practice under various conditions and in many countries. But it was the fortunate accident that directed his attention to ovariectomy which raised him to the highest rank in the profession, and enabled him to render services to humanity which no one in our day has surpassed with the single exception of Lord Lister. Now in speaking of Spencer Wells's career there is one error very commonly committed. Seeing the striking success of ovariectomy, and the immense saving of life it has effected, people often speak of him—the true founder of ovariectomy—as if his merit had been to combat, and by indomitable perseverance to uproot, an unfounded prejudice. We who are old enough to recollect the state of things at that time know well enough that it was no unfounded prejudice which great surgeons like Lawrence, and great obstetricians like Robert Lee, entertained against ovariectomy in these conditions; but a very real and well-founded objection, an objection founded on what was then the appalling mortality of the operation. And Spencer Wells's merit was not merely that by courage and perseverance he outlived a determined opposition, but that he so improved the details of the operation as to render it no longer murderous; and that by never operating in his hospital without professional spectators, and carefully publishing every case, he stopped the mouths of those who

believed that his apparent success was due to concealment of bad cases, till at length, when the cases counted by hundreds, and when his scholars began to attain the same success, it was no longer possible to deny to ovariectomy a place in ordinary surgery. This merit is far beyond any that could be attained by mere courage or perseverance, amply as he was endowed with those qualities. It was the reward of skill in diagnosis, and an operative dexterity only equalled by his boldness and his care. He was fortunate, indeed, in living long enough to enjoy his well-won honours, and to see ovariectomy introduced into every country in which scientific surgery is practised."

It may be thought that with the additional safeguards of recent times ovariectomy must have become common and successful, even though Spencer Wells had not shown the way. But he made it both, though he had not the advantages which modern science has provided. In him we have an illustration of the success which may be achieved by a man who does one thing and does it supremely well. We see the advantage of specialism. When a difficult and dangerous thing has to be done, it is better that it should be done by one who has had practice than by one who is seeking to acquire it. Spencer Wells was more fortunate with his later cases than with his earlier. The apprentice may be as confident as the master, but he will not be equally successful. In the surgical history of our time the name of Spencer Wells will ever retain a prominent and honorable place.

In *Dr. James Ellison*, of Windsor, the profession has lost a man who did much to increase the esteem with which it is regarded.

Dr. Ellison was born in India, and was educated in medicine at first by Dr. Thomas Walker of Peterborough, and afterwards at St. Bartholomew's Hospital and the University of Heidelberg. After having graduated at the University of London, Dr. Ellison began practice in Wimpole Street, but after six years he joined the late Mr. Henry Brown of Windsor, who was Surgeon-Apothecary

to the Royal Household, to which office Dr. Ellison ultimately succeeded. He also became Surgeon to the Windsor Royal Infirmary. Dr. Ellison's subsequent life was passed at Windsor. He died there of cancer of the œsophagus, on the 31st of last January, at the age of seventy-nine.

He was a many-sided and even a remarkable man. I learn that his professional accuracy and tact were such that he enjoyed in an unusual degree the confidence of his patients. He was honoured with the approval of the Queen, who, upon being informed of his death, commanded Sir James Reid to express to Dr. Ellison's family "Her Majesty's sincere regret at the loss of one who has served her so long and so faithfully, and for whom she entertained the greatest regard."

But not only in the profession was Dr. Ellison accomplished. He was widely read, a linguist, a musician, and an artist, and was familiar with the use, for scientific purposes, both of the microscope and the telescope. He was in the early part of his life fond of field sports, and was an active volunteer, first as a combatant, latterly as a medical officer.

In every way he maintained the honour of his calling, and by his cultivation and character acquired respect in more modes than often falls to the lot of one who belongs to a profession so exacting as that of medicine.

I now have to refer to the loss of one whose friendship I enjoyed for more than forty years, and whose recent death will be present in the minds of all who hear me speak.

George David Pollock was the second son of the great general who retrieved the disaster of the Khyber Pass. The general was one of four brothers, three of whom attained to great distinction, and rendered great services to the State. One became Chief Baron, another President of the High Court of India.

Mr. Pollock was born in India in the year 1817, and became a student at St. George's in 1837, with which

hospital he remained closely connected until his death. He was house surgeon under Sir Benjamin Brodie, and was subsequently sent by him to Canada to take medical charge of Lord Metcalfe, the Governor-General, who had become the subject of cancer of the face. Mr. Pollock was charged with the instructions of the great surgeon with regard to Lord Metcalfe's disease. Upon Mr. Pollock's return to England he became Demonstrator, and afterwards Lecturer on Anatomy. His first appointment as a hospital surgeon was to Great Ormond Street in 1852. In the following year he succeeded to the post of Assistant Surgeon to St. George's, and remained an active member of the staff of that hospital until his resignation in 1880. But his interest in the hospital and school did not terminate with his responsible appointment. He continued to take a prominent part as Governor, and as a member of some of the most important committees, in the management of the institution ; and as lately as October, 1895, he delivered, as he had once done before, the Introductory Address. To revert to matters outside the hospital, Mr. Pollock, upon the marriage of the Prince of Wales, received the appointment of Surgeon in Ordinary to the Prince. At the Pathological Society, of which he was one of the early supporters, he became Secretary in 1850 and President in 1875. He was chosen as President of our own Society in 1886. He long held the office of Examiner in Surgery for the Army and the East India Medical Service. No doubt the highest offices at the College of Surgeons would have been open to him had he not until the last year of his life refused to become a candidate for the Council. He thought it derogatory to solicit vouchers of his fitness as councillor. At the last election, hoping thereby to assist what is called the liberal party, he overcame his objection and complied with the necessary preliminaries ; but his advanced age, I presume, prevented his being successful. His attitude at the College always struck me as not what might have been expected from one of his natural bias. He was by nature conservative and conventional. He

stood by the old roads, and viewed any departure from them with distrust. But the old roads were never trodden with more dignity and propriety than by the high-minded and honorable gentleman whose loss we have now to regret. He even carried his conservatism into small particulars, and regarded with disapproval any innovations in dress or adornment which might take the undisciplined fancy of a generation younger than his own. Mr. Pollock's standard of professional conduct was high, even to fastidiousness. Anything approaching self-advertisement was abhorrent, and even impossible to him. Upright in conduct and punctilious in demeanour, he acquired the respect of all who value rectitude of purpose and the attitude of a gentleman. Mr. Pollock was born to social influence, and his kindly and sympathetic nature made him widely popular. I suppose few men have had more friends ; he took pleasure in extending a helping hand to those who wanted it, and the name of those whom he befriended was legion. Many must look back to him as having provided them with the first step in their success in life.

Much as I respected Mr. Pollock in every phase, I feel that my own knowledge is insufficient to do adequate justice to his accomplishments as a surgeon. I have therefore appealed to a surgical colleague, whom I will not indicate further than to say that I have already been indebted to him on this occasion. He writes, " Mr. Pollock occupied a very high place in the surgical profession. He was peculiarly well qualified both for hospital and private practice. He was a bold and skilful operator, a careful and sagacious consultant, and he was fond of teaching, so that he was equally acceptable to the students and his colleagues. He was endeared to his patients by a genuine kindness both of manner and of action, which especially fitted him for private practice, in which he early attained considerable success, and where he earned the gratitude and affection of a large circle of friends. Without any claim to originality, he worthily supported the reputation of the great surgical school at

which he was educated; and the hospital of Hunter, Brodie, Cæsar Hawkins, and Prescott Hewitt counted him as one of its chief ornaments. To that hospital he was sincerely devoted, and its maintenance and improvement were the objects of his unceasing care and study. He had many other tastes apart from his profession, was fond of country pursuits, of farming, and of building, and found a refuge in his country seat near Ascot, which provided him with all the distraction he required, and enabled him to dispense with the holidays in which most London surgeons find it necessary to indulge. But, indeed, he had a genuine love of London, and of London practice, which mingled strangely with his enjoyment of long voyages and foreign travel on the rare occasions when he could persuade himself to take a long period of rest and change.

“Mr. Pollock was a vigorous supporter of our great medical societies. He served the Pathological Society zealously as Secretary, and presided over it with his usual ability. His services to our own Society in various minor offices, and as President, are too fresh in our memory to need further notice or praise from me. His contributions to our ‘Transactions’ were not numerous, but some of them at any rate are of high surgical interest. Mr. Pollock had given great attention to the cure of congenital fissure of the palate, and his paper in the thirty-ninth volume of the ‘Transactions’ marks the advance in that branch of surgery which his labours and those of Mr. Avery (to whom he does ample justice) had gained previous to the employment of chloroform in the operation and its consequent application to young children. The treatise also “On Dislocation of the Os Calcis and Scaphoid from the Astragalus,” in vol. liii, is a standard authority on that subject.

“I cannot close this brief reference to a long and honorable career without some expression of the deep regret which all St. George’s men must feel at the loss of

one so greatly esteemed as a teacher, a colleague, and a friend."

I need add but little in my own person to what has been so judiciously expressed. It always seemed to me that with Mr. Pollock's intellect and opportunities he might have done more than he did; that he might have left more footprints on the sands of time than he placed there. Perhaps he wanted energy. His brain was an excellent instrument, but the driving power did not seem commensurate. It may be that he was too successful to care to be more so; it may be that he was unduly sensitive to criticism, though on that score he need have had no apprehension.

Mr. Pollock died on the 14th of last month, in his eightieth year, after a few days' illness from pneumonia. He continued in practice until arrested by his fatal illness.

If honour, respect, and troops of friends are the proper accompaniments of old age, he had his due in these particulars.

William Smythe Crawford, of Liverpool, died in February of the present year, at the age of thirty-seven. He was educated at Cambridge, Liverpool, and Edinburgh, and became Assistant Surgeon to the Liverpool Cancer and Skin Hospital. He was the author of several papers dealing, among other subjects, with carcinoma, epithelioma, and sarcoma. He appears to have been much respected and regretted.

SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING

HELD IN

THE SOCIETY'S HOUSE, 20, HANOVER SQUARE, W.,

on Tuesday, June 8th, 1897, at 8.30 p.m.

W. HOWSHIP DICKINSON, M.D., President, in the Chair.

NORMAN MOORE, M.D.,
ROBERT WILLIAM PARKER, } Hon. Secs.

Present—30 Fellows.

The President on behalf of the Council proposed—

“That the Bye-laws as revised by the Council be adopted as the Bye-laws of the Society.”

Dr. Church explained that since the reprinting of the revised Bye-laws the Society's solicitors had suggested verbal amendments which, with the approval of his colleagues on the Bye-laws Revision Committee, he desired to formally move.

Dr. Church then proposed the following amendments in the Bye-laws now submitted for adoption :

Chapter II, sections 1 and 2 :

That for the words “Christian and surname” the words “full name” be substituted.

Chapter II, section 3 :

That the words “According to the form No. I in the Appendix” be omitted.

Chapter II, section 6, line 4 :

That the words “According to Form No. II of the Appendix” be omitted.

Chapter II, section 6, line 5 :

That the word “the” be substituted for “an,” and that the words “According to Form No. II of the Appendix” be omitted.

And that the Appendix be removed from the Bye-laws and incorporated with the Standing Orders.

These amendments were carried unanimously.

Dr. Abercrombie moved—

Chapter II, section 6, line 3 :

For the words “ his ” and “ him ” read “ their ” and “ them.”

This amendment was carried unanimously.

Mr. T. Holmes moved as an amendment that—

“Those portions of the revised Bye-laws which altered the radius of Resident Fellowship from fifteen miles to seven miles be not adopted.”

The amendment was seconded by Mr. Haward, and was not adopted.

The President then proposed from the Chair the adoption of the revised Bye-laws as amended. A ballot was taken with the following result :

For	22
Against	2
<hr/>					
Majority	20

The President thereupon declared that the Bye-laws had been duly adopted in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and Bye-laws, and declared the Special General Meeting closed.